



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,541	01/16/2002	Gavriel Meron	P-3228-US	1799
49443	7590	05/19/2008		
Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP			EXAMINER	
1500 Broadway			CWERN, JONATHAN	
12th Floor				
New York, NY 10036			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3737	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/046,541	Applicant(s) MERON ET AL.	
	Examiner Jonathan G. Cwern	Art Unit 3737	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 51, 53-55, 57-60 and 63-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 51, 53-55, 57-60 and 63-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 1/16/02 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/6/08 has been entered.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: In Figure 6, reference numerals 65, 66, and 67 are not in the specification. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract no longer applies to the claimed invention. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

Claims 55, 57-59, and 63-67 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 55, "an imager" and "an optical window" should be referred to as "said imager" and "said optical window at the front end" or "said optical window at the rear end" if referring to the same items claimed in claim 51. Claim 51 sets forth that each window covers an imager. This implies that there is more than one imager in the device. Therefore, it is unclear which imager is being referred to in claim 57. It is also unclear as to whether there are two transmitters, or only one, as it will depend on the number of imagers in the device which is unclear. In claims 58 and 59, it is unclear as to what structure allows for the transmitter to function as set forth. The claims appear to merely set forth how the device operates without setting forth additional structure to allow it to function that way. In claim 63, on line 7, remove the word "the" from the phrase "the to a receiver". Also, in claim 63, lines 4-6 are confusing. It is unclear as to how images can be obtained from optical windows. In claim 66, it is unclear as to how the imaging device relates to the means used to obtain images in claim 63. In claim 67, it is unclear what signals are being transmitted, and how this step connects with the previously set forth method. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 51, 53-55, 57-58, 60, and 63-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ouchi (US 6547723) in view of Ueda et al. (US 5681260).

Ouchi shows a fully-swallowable endoscopic system. The device has two hard portions, at opposite ends. Each hard portion has an illumination window, an objective optical system (this is interpreted as the claimed "lens"), an image sensor, and an LED (illumination source). The lens is positioned behind the optical windows, between the image sensor and the window (column 5, lines 34-67 and Figure 2). The device also contains a radio-transmitter for transmitting the acquired image data to an external device (column 7, lines 43-67). Ouchi fails to show a plurality of illumination sources

corresponding to each imager, that the windows are dome shaped, and that the device is capsule shaped.

Ueda et al. disclose a guiding apparatus for guiding an insertable body within an inspected object. One embodiment of the device comprises a capsule endoscope. Ueda et al. teach that one imager (CCD) is used along with multiple LEDs (Figure 27 and column 18, lines 8-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have used a plurality of LEDs with each imager, as taught by Ueda et al. in the device of Ouchi. The benefits of multiple light sources are old and well known in the art. Additional light sources can provide for a larger sized area to be illuminated, or a differently shaped area to be illuminated. They can be used to illuminate the area more brightly than a single source. Multiple light sources have also been used to provide different wavelengths of light which can be analyzed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified the device of Ouchi to include those features. In the absence of any showing of criticality or unexpected results, changing the size and/or shape of the device is an obvious modification. Making the windows dome shaped so that the device is more round may allow it to pass easier through the patient, as well as by making the device a capsule shape (see MPEP 2144.04).

It should be noted that Ouchi discusses problems related to capsule type endoscopes in column 1, lines 33-54, however this refers to tethered endoscopes, in which a portion of the endoscope is still outside of the patient. Ouchi seeks to overcome problems related to such endoscopes by a "fully-swallowable" system in

which the entire system is within the patient. Therefore, Ouchi does not teach away from modifying the device to make it capsule shaped.

Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ouchi (US 6547723) in view of Ueda et al. (US 5681260) as applied to claim 57 above, and further in view of Hogrefe et al. (US 5415181).

Hogrefe et al. disclose a multi-channel ingestible biomedical monitoring system. Hogrefe et al. teach that signals from an ingestible capsule can be transmitted over multiple channels (abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have transmitted over multiple channels as taught by Hogrefe et al., in the device of Ouchi. Hogrefe et al. use a different channel for different physiological signals. One of ordinary skill in the art would have modified the device of Ouchi to transmit over a different channel for the signals acquired by each imager.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 51, 53-55, 57-60, and 63-67 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan G. Cwern whose telephone number is

(571)270-1560. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:30AM - 6:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on 571-272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jonathan G Cwern/
Examiner, Art Unit 3737

/Ruth S. Smith/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3737